REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed Aug. 14, 2007. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the below discussion. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the case.

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended.

No new claims have been added.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §112

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in relation to antecedent basis for the phrase "the bRIB." The Applicant has amended claims 6 and 17 and now believes this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

At pages 2-8 of the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Norman et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,054,311 (hereinafter "Norman") in view of Crump, U.S. Patent No 6,999,454 (hereinafter "Crump").

The Applicant's claim 1, representative in part of the other rejected claims, sets forth (emphasis added):

> 1. A distributed software architecture system configured to implement a routing protocol in a router of a computer network, the system comprising:
> a plurality of processors;
> a switch fabric interconnecting the processors; and
> ***a plurality of processes each running on a different one of the processors, the processes including two or more speakers and a protocol routing information base (RIB)***, each speaker configured to (i) handle one or more connections to peer routers of the router, (ii) receive and store routes from those peer routers, (iii) apply inbound policy to the routes received from the peer routers and (iv) download all routes received from the peer routers, except those filtered by the inbound policy, to the protocol RIB, the protocol RIB configured to perform a first stage of route selection to compute a set of best routes from among the routes downloaded from all of the speakers of the router.

Norman discloses a router with a distributed memory storage architecture. *See* abstract. Line cards (Fig. 1A, 104), having a processor (112) for low-level processing, receive packets from peers. Controller cards, that include a CPU 120, manage all routing related functions. That is, "[w]hile processor 112 in the line card 104 is responsible for processing received traffic packets, it is the controller card 110 which is responsible for processing routing information." *See* col. 6, lines 65 to col. 7, line 4. The CPU on the controller card constructs a RIB and performs route selection in distributed memory (Fig. 1A,130X and 130Y) by "run various foreground and background tasks...[that] may involve running separate BGP sessions with the various peers to which the router 100A is connected." *See* col. 7, lines 5-12, 18-30 and col. 9, line 21-29.

Crump discloses a router where routing tables are distributed across a number of control processor "CP" cards and "service termination (ST) cards. *See* col. 5, lines 58-59, and col. 6, lines 30-33. Differing portions of a routing table, and backup copies, are constructed and maintained by different cards. *See* Fig. 12, RT1, RT2, RT3 and also col. 8, line 8 to col. 9, line 60.

The Applicant respectfully urges that both Norman and Crump are silent concerning the Applicant's claimed "***a plurality of processes each running on a different one of the processors, the processes including two or more speakers and a protocol routing information base (RIB)***."

Rather than teach an architecture where two or more speakers and a protocol routing information base (RIB) are separated and running on different processors, both Norman and Crump suggest functionality should be consolidated on the same processor. For example, Norman discusses controller cards with a CPU that performs all types of functionality related to implementing a routing protocol. There is no suggestion in Norman of separation on different processors of speaker and RIB functionality. Similarly, Crump describes service termination (ST) cards that perform all types of functionality related to implementing a routing protocol. Again, there is no suggestion in Crump of separation on different processors of speaker and RIB functionality.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Norman and Crump is legally insufficient to make obvious the present claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 because of the absence of the Applicant's claimed novel "***a plurality of processes each running on a different one of the processors, the processes including two or more speakers and a protocol routing information base (RIB)***."

At pages 8-9 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Norman and Crump in further view of Weyman, U.S. Patent Publication No 2005/0041665 (hereinafter "Weyman").

The Applicant notes that claim 10 is a dependent claim that depends from an independent claim believed to be allowable. Accordingly, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable due to such dependency as well as for other separate reasons.

Should the Examiner believe a telephonic interview would be helpful in the disposition of this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-2500.

In summary, all the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore all dependent claims that depend there from are believed to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully solicits favorable action.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500